FLOCK CAMERAS AND THE 2027 BUDGET: A RESPONSE TO THE NOVEMBER 2 DISCUSSION

To: Marathon County Board of Supervisors

From: Felix Gallo, Wausau

Date: November 3, 2026

Re: The Sheriff's Office Flock cameras, the 2027 budget, and the discussion at the November 2 budget hearing

Dear Supervisors --

You heard my name a few times at the November 2 budget hearing, so I want to follow up in writing. Thank you to Supervisor Morache for asking what the Board's options are, to Supervisor Robinson for offering to bring the Sheriff and me together, and to Sheriff Billeb and Supervisor Krembs for taking the concerns on directly. I take the Sheriff at his word that his office means to use these cameras well, and I appreciate his openness to having others take part in audits.

The Sheriff attributed some of the resistance to mass surveillance systems as being social media misinformation. There could be some truth to that, but in this case, I can attest that all of my data, analysis, and citations are from the FBI, Flock's statements, public data sources, executed contracts, transcripts of Board meetings, and other reliable sources, which I have footnoted extensively in each of my documents. Where I am wrong, I invite correction.

Several statements made that afternoon don't match the public record. The Board's next decisions come quickly. Amendments go to the Human Resources, Finance and Property Committee on Monday, November 9; the Sheriff presents to the Public Safety Committee and the full Board votes on the 2027 budget on Tuesday, November 10. Every fact below carries a numbered note with a link to its source, and every quotation from the hearing links to that moment in the county's video.[1]

I respectfully ask the Board to:

1. Ask that a notice of non-renewal for the first 5 cameras be sent now. It costs nothing to send, it is timely on any reading of the contract's start date, and it keeps every option open. It does not bind the County to an exit, but it does allow for it.[4]
2. Hold the $6,300 the proposed 2027 budget carries for those cameras in contingency until the sharing, access, audit and retention steps below are taken.[1]
3. Ask the Sheriff to limit sharing to Wisconsin agencies and named task-force partners, and to keep the list current on the portal.[3]
4. Ask the Sheriff to limit access to sworn supervisors, as has been done in Milwaukee.[43]
5. Ask that Policy 423.5(e) require audits on a fixed schedule with written findings, and take up Supervisor Robinson's call for oversight -- for example, a group that reviews audit logs with plates masked.[5]
6. Ask the Sheriff to switch to Flock's now-default 7-day retention setting.[13]
7. Ask for the records that would show whether the program works: audit reports and summarized counts of hits that led to stops, recovered vehicles, arrests and convictions.

Please don't hesitate to reach out with any questions, comments, improvements, or corrections. Thank you!

Felix Gallo

THE STATEMENTS AND THE RECORD

Twelve statements from the hearing, each beside what the public record shows. I believe all of them were made in good faith, and several are partly right; the point is the fuller picture. Times link to the county's video.[1]

Statement	Speaker and time	What the record shows
"That data does not leave Marathon County. It doesn't leave the	Sheriff Billeb, 1:32:00	The Sheriff's own portal lists about 1,580 organizations in roughly 40 states that can search the data, including the FBI and two federal drug task

Statement	Speaker and time	What the record shows
Marathon County Sheriff's Office"		forces. Earlier he confirmed sharing "outside of the state of Wisconsin."[3]
"It isn't shared with any other private entity, company, you name it"	Sheriff Billeb, 1:29:30	Flock, a private company, hosts the data and holds a perpetual license to use it in so-called 'de-identified' form for "other Flock offerings." Flock's de-identification method is not published. The agreement also says Flock "shall not sell" it, but does not define what 'sell' means.[4]
"There's this misconception that we don't do audits. That's because our policy says we may"	Sheriff Billeb, 1:28:49	Policy 423.5(e) makes audits optional. No audit record has been released, and requests for audit reports were denied.[5,7]
"The captain … told the committee that he does the audits twice a month"	Sheriff Billeb, 1:28:49	Accurate as to what the Captain said: "at least twice a month," but "not at a set date and time."[2]
"You have to have a case number, meaning there has to be an incident report"	Supervisor Krembs, relaying the Sheriff, 1:25:32	Policy 423.3(e) asks for a reason and case number typed into a text field. A Milwaukee officer typed "investigation" 179 times while tracking a former girlfriend and her ex-boyfriend. Flock will require case codes from January 1, 2027.[5,13,17]
"Those people were custodially arrested and terminated from their law enforcement positions"	Supervisor Krembs, 1:24:43	Of seven known Wisconsin misuse cases, reporting shows one arrest (Menasha) and one firing (Milwaukee). Three officers resigned, one was suspended and one was counseled. Misuse that no victim uncovers and no audit catches can stay hidden; nationally the Washington Post found at least 50 cases.[14,17–23]
"When they have, they've been arrested, they've been charged"	Sheriff Billeb, 1:30:57	Officers in Milwaukee, Menasha and Kenosha County were charged. In Racine County the district attorney declined charges twice.[17–22]
"There is no expectation of privacy when you are driving down a road, a public road"	Supervisor Krembs, 1:24:43	True of one plate seen once. Courts are divided on when a plate-reader search becomes a Fourth Amendment search; a federal court suppressed evidence from a warrantless Flock search on October 1, and the Wisconsin Supreme Court has been asked to rule.[28–36]
"We absolutely do not use that tool for immigration"	Sheriff Billeb, 1:30:57	True of his deputies, as far as the record shows. But partner agencies follow their own rules, and federal immigration agencies have reached Flock data through local partners elsewhere. Nothing in county policy stops a partner agency from running a search for someone else, and 404 Media found officers elsewhere doing exactly that for federal agents, including ICE.[9–12]
The squad-car computer is "light years ahead of any ALPR technology"	Sheriff Billeb, 1:32:00	Those systems show who owns a car or whether someone is wanted, not where a car has been over the course of the last month. State DOJ audits TIME use at least every three years; no outside body audits the county's Flock searches.[26]
"The grants are paid"	Sheriff Billeb, 1:28:10	The Administrator said both grants' funds are spent. The Sheriff's proposed 2027 budget carries $6,300 to continue 5 cameras.[1]
"A total of 8 that are directly attributable to the county"	Administrator Leonhard, 1:21:09	Correct for the county's own cameras. The portal lists 10; the Captain said in August that 2 are paid for by Rib Mountain.[2,3]

WHO CAN SEARCH THE COUNTY'S CAMERA DATA

The Sheriff said "that data does not leave Marathon County" (1:32:00). In context he may have meant that he has been assured that it is never sold, and the agreement does forbid a direct sale. But the data is searchable far beyond the county, and the Board should know how far.[1]

About 1,580 organizations have access. The Sheriff's Office transparency portal, read October 21, 2026, lists 2,165 sharing entries: about 1,580 distinct organizations in roughly 40 states. They include 275 agencies in Illinois, 228 in Ohio, 194 in Wisconsin, 163 in Indiana and 132 in Michigan.[3]

Federal and state bodies on the county's sharing list	
Federal	FBI; Indiana HIDTA; Midwest HIDTA; U.S. Postal Inspection Service; Wright-Patterson Air Force Base; Indiana Dunes National Park; Natchez Trace Parkway
Other states	Departments of corrections of Alabama, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa and Texas; Illinois Attorney General; California Highway Patrol

Sharing means direct access. Officers at those organizations search the county's reads themselves. Marathon County's Policy 423, its audits and its "prohibited uses" list govern deputies; each partner follows its own rules.[3,5]

The county cannot control what partners do. In 2025, 404 Media found police across the country, including searches of Illinois cameras, running lookups for federal agents "as an 'informal' favor," with reasons such as "ICE," though Flock had no contract with ICE.[9] Illinois law banned immigration-related sharing, yet the Secretary of State's audit found Customs and Border Protection had reached Illinois plate data anyway.[11] A letter from Senator Wyden showed Homeland Security Investigations, the Secret Service and Navy investigators had network access.[10] I don't doubt the Sheriff when he says "we absolutely do not use that tool for immigration" (1:30:57); the concern is the county's data in other hands.

Two partners belong to a federal program. On September 30, 2026, 404 Media reported that the White House-run HIDTA program sends local plate data, including Flock's, onto federal servers other agencies can search, raising questions, in 404 Media's words, about "what it is being used for." The article does not say whether Marathon County's data is among it. Senator Wyden has since demanded the program's privacy review.[12] The county shares with two HIDTAs. Flock removed federal agencies from its nationwide lookup in August 2025, but the county's own list still gives the FBI, both HIDTAs and the Postal Inspection Service access.[3,13]

Flock holds a license to the data. The Sheriff said the data "isn't shared with any other private entity" (1:29:30). Flock is a private company and hosts it. Section 4.3 of the 2022 agreement grants Flock "a non-exclusive, perpetual, irrevocable, worldwide, royalty-free, fully paid license to use, reproduce, modify and distribute the Agency Data as a part of the Aggregated Data." Section 4.5 lets Flock use that de-identified data for "other Flock offerings," and states that "Flock shall not sell Agency Data or Aggregated Data."[4] Whether county reads feed Flock's paid Traffic Analytics product was asked on September 4 and was unanswered in mid-September.[6,8] In September the Racine County Sheriff ordered his cameras removed over Traffic Analytics, calling it "not what we agreed to."[15]

The company is expanding what the network can do. In August 2026, Wired reported that Flock is testing "OS Investigate," an AI tool that lets officers search the network by place, time window, movement pattern, and personally identifiable characteristics such as tattoos, instead of a known plate, and that can link plates to drivers and their associates through 911 logs, arrest records and other databases. Flock says it is in testing with a small group of agencies.[46] Flock's chief executive has also been dismissive of public concern. In a 2025 Forbes interview he called DeFlock, a citizens' group that maps the cameras, a "terroristic organization" and, by several accounts, compared it to antifa; in July 2026 he apologized: "My comments were a mistake and I apologize."[47] In October, leaked audio from a private police conference recorded him telling police chiefs that the backlash against Flock is not real, that critics are "getting paid to say these things," and, without evidence, that online opposition is driven largely by Russian bots.[48] This is the company that holds a perpetual license to the county's data in said-to-be de-identified form.

The task force needs much less than this. The Sheriff explained that a federal narcotics task force works from his office and that drug cases cross state lines (1:29:30). That is a real need. It can be met by sharing with named task-force partners and answering other requests case by case, without standing access for an Air Force base, two National Park Service sites and five out-of-state prison systems.

AUDITS AND OVERSIGHT

The Sheriff called it "this misconception that we don't do audits. That's because our policy says we may" (1:28:49). I agree the misunderstanding starts with the policy, and the fix is in the Board's and the Sheriff's hands.

The policy makes audits optional. Policy 423.5(e) reads: "Sheriff Command staff may conduct audits of ALPR access and browsing inquiries using random data samples at any time."[5] The policy template the office adopted in 2023 said audits "should be conducted on a regular basis"; that sentence was removed in the September 2023 revision.[7] Asked in August whether "may" could become "shall," the Captain said, "Certainly it can. Whether it will, we would have to discuss in the future."[2]

No audit has been shown to the Board or the public. The Captain said he is in the system "at least twice a month" but "not at a set date and time."[2] The office has denied records requests for audit reports and says it has never issued a corrective action.[7]

The searches are many, and one month is a small window. The portal's 132 searches is a 30-day count.[3] USA TODAY's collection of the office's audit logs shows about 23,400 searches from 2023 to 2026; one plate was searched 133 times over 48 days with "drugs" as the reason.[7] Whether anyone reviews outside agencies' searches of county data has not been said. When Verona checked a single month, it found 974 federal searches of its cameras, most by the Postal Inspection Service.[16]

A typed case number is a good rule that needs checking. Policy 423.3(e) asks for a reason and case number in the search field.[5] Only an audit that compares those entries with case files shows they are real. Flock itself will require case codes and its "audit assistance" tool from January 1, 2027.[13] In early August, a Flock spokesman told the Washington Post that only about 1 in 4 agencies had turned that tool on.[14]

Audit logs can be shared without harming cases. The Sheriff said audit logs are protected because they concern "active, open, ongoing cases" (1:35:00). USA TODAY obtained such logs under the public records law.[7] Wisconsin's public records law is to be read "with a presumption of complete public access."[41] And once data is shared, other states' records laws apply: Fond du Lac and Winnebago County agencies suspended Flock in September after out-of-state agencies released their search logs.[15]

There is real common ground here. Supervisor Robinson spoke of "building in an oversight and accountability mechanisms" (1:33:31). The Sheriff answered that he is interested in having people "be a part of that audit," provided it stays confidential: "I'm very interested in that conversation" (1:35:00). A workable version of that: "shall" in Policy 423.5(e), a monthly schedule, written findings, and quarterly review of masked logs by a small group, such as a supervisor, Corporation Counsel and a resident.

MISUSE AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN WISCONSIN

Supervisor Krembs said that when the system is abused, "we need to hold those who abuse that to accountability and not take the tool itself away," and compared it to firearms and squad cars (1:23:59, 1:24:23). I agree with holding people accountable. The Wisconsin record alone shows how hard that is when no one is required to look.

The Wisconsin cases, how they came to light, and what happened:

Agency	What happened	How it came to light	Outcome
Milwaukee PD	Officer ran 179 searches on a former girlfriend and her ex-boyfriend, each labeled "investigation"	A victim checked a public lookup site and alerted police	Resigned; pleaded guilty to attempted misconduct in office, a misdemeanor; probation and a $500 fine[17]
Milwaukee PD	Detective investigating that officer searched one person's plate 17 times (20 searches of two people) and put a GPS tracker on that person's car	An anonymous tip, then an internal audit after the first case; a victim also came forward	Fired; charged with felony misconduct; pleaded not guilty[18]
Menasha PD	Officer searched his ex-girlfriend's car, labeling searches "welfare" checks	She complained; Appleton police investigated and arrested him	Arrested; resigned; 6 months in jail and 3 years' probation[19]
Kenosha County Sheriff	Deputy ran 16 to 17 off-duty searches on a fellow deputy he was dating	An internal audit, fall 2025	Resigned; charged with two felonies in August 2026[20]
Racine County Sheriff	Investigator tracked his partner's former partner	Not reported	10-day unpaid suspension; district attorney declined charges twice[21]
Waukesha PD	One officer ran hundreds of searches with "." as the reason	A Wisconsin Examiner review of audit data	Counseled and retrained[22]
Waukesha County Sheriff	Deputies searched a Navy veteran's plate more than 100 times after he filmed a stop and complained; one testified he was ordered to	His federal lawsuit	Lawsuit alleging retaliation[23]

What the cases show. Supervisor Krembs said the officers "were custodially arrested and terminated from their law enforcement positions" (1:24:43). Reporting shows one arrest and one firing; three officers resigned. He may have meant Menasha, where the officer was arrested; Neenah has no reported case and suspended its own Flock use in September.[15] Wisconsin law requires decertification after a felony conviction and, unless the state board finds it unwarranted, after a firing or a resignation in lieu of firing for just cause; I found no reported action against these

officers.[24] In several cases the victim found out first. Internal audits caught the Kenosha County deputy and the Milwaukee detective, and a newspaper's review of audit data found the Waukesha officer, which is the best argument I know for requiring audits.

Why the firearms comparison is imperfect. A police shooting is known at once, and any officer-involved death in Wisconsin must be investigated by at least two investigators from outside the officer's agency.[27] A misused plate search leaves nothing its target can see, unless they happen to check a public lookup site. Nationally, the Washington Post found at least 50 officers charged or accused of using plate readers to track people.[14] Firearms and police cars are clearly necessary tools of law enforcement, but laws were successfully enforced before mass surveillance systems and can be enforced without them.

A third path exists. Dane County's board dropped Flock in April, then voted 26-7 in June to fund a replacement plate-reader system chosen by competitive bid. Its planned rules include county control of the data, weekly audits and no immigration or traffic use; four vendors have bid.[39] The choice is not simply keeping the tool or taking it away.

Stale alerts travel too. Supervisor Sondelski raised wrongful arrests (1:35:35), and the Sheriff answered that "there is crummy police work" (1:36:11). In August, Milwaukee police failed to clear a wanted-vehicle alert. Amber Newell was stopped at gunpoint by Milwaukee police, then stopped again at gunpoint and handcuffed by Brookfield officers on I-94 on August 6.[25] The county's rule that an alert alone cannot justify a stop is the right safeguard; audits are how the Board can know it is followed.[5]

The squad computer comparison. The Sheriff said the squad-car computer is "light years ahead of any ALPR technology" and mentioned the TIME system (1:32:00). Those systems tell an officer who owns a car or whether someone is wanted; they do not record where a car has been. TIME use is also audited by the state Department of Justice at least once every three years, and continued access depends on following its rules.[26] Nothing comparable applies to the county's Flock searches.

State law has not caught up. The Sheriff said he has discussed penalties and a ban on selling the data with legislators (1:30:57), which I welcome. Attorney General Kaul asked the Legislature for a plate-reader law in September, and Rep. Callahan plans a hearing in January.[37,38] Until a law passes, county policy is the main rule.

PRIVACY ON PUBLIC ROADS

Supervisor Krembs said "there is no expectation of privacy when you are driving down a road, a public road, and your license plate data is obtained by somebody" (1:24:43). That is right about one officer seeing one plate. Whether searching a database of every car that passed the county's 10 cameras over 30 days is a Fourth Amendment search is a different question, and courts are now split on it.

The scale. The county's cameras recorded 464,012 different vehicles in 30 days.[3] Running a plate on a squad computer tells an officer who owns the car; a Flock search tells where and when the car was seen.

Recent rulings, both ways:

Case	Court and date	Held
United States v. Kyle	Federal district court, Oklahoma, Oct. 1, 2026	A warrantless Flock query returning 50+ sightings over about 30 days was a search, "a type of indiscriminate mass surveillance"; evidence suppressed[29]
Chatrie v. United States	U.S. Supreme Court, June 29, 2026 (6-3)	Obtaining a person's location data from a company is a search, even for two hours; the Court sent the warrant questions back. It did not address plate readers and distinguished tracking on public roads[28]
United States v. Porter	Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, Mar. 17, 2026	Hits from about ten road cameras were not a search (decided before *Chatrie*); a petition for Supreme Court review is pending[32]
Schmidt v. City of Norfolk	Federal district court, Virginia, Jan. 27, 2026	Norfolk's 176 cameras were not intrusive enough to be a search; on appeal, fully briefed[33]
United States v. Riley	Federal district court, California, Sept. 2026	No search on a handful of photographs from two cities' cameras[34]
Commonwealth v.	Court of Appeals of Virginia,	Reversed the *Bell* judge in another Norfolk case: 30 days of Flock

Case	Court and date	Held
Church	Oct. 14, 2025 (unpublished)	captures on public roads were not a search[44]
Commonwealth v. Bell	Virginia trial court, May 2024	Warrantless use of Norfolk's Flock network was a search[31]
Commonwealth v. McCarthy	Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, Apr. 2020	Four bridge cameras were not a search, but "enough cameras in enough locations" would be[30]

Wisconsin is next. On September 10, 2026 the Wisconsin Institute for Law and Liberty sued Waukesha County and 11 municipalities, seeking a warrant requirement for Flock searches.[35] On October 14 the ACLU of Wisconsin and the Electronic Frontier Foundation asked the Wisconsin Supreme Court to take the case directly and rule that the state constitution requires a warrant for plate-reader searches.[36] Concern now spans parties. The Wisconsin Institute for Law and Liberty and the ACLU have both gone to court. Republican Rep. Callahan and Democratic Attorney General Kaul have both called for state limits.[37,38] Both major-party candidates for governor have proposed limits too: Democrat David Crowley has directed Milwaukee County departments to restrict Flock use, and Republican Tom Tiffany has said he would pause state funding for Flock cameras.[45] And more than a dozen Wisconsin agencies have dropped or suspended Flock this year.[6]

What it means for the county. No court that binds Marathon County has required a warrant. If one does, deputies will need a warrant to search the data, and defendants may move to suppress evidence from past searches. Shorter retention and narrower sharing reduce that exposure whatever the courts decide.

COST, CONTRACT DATES AND RESULTS

The Sheriff said "the grants are paid and we are constantly evaluating" (1:28:10). The Administrator's answer to Supervisor Morache shows the program now moving into the county budget, and no evaluation has yet been published.

What the Administrator said. The first grant "is fully expended" and the second grant's funds "have been expended" (1:21:48, 1:22:37). The first contract "runs out, and I believe at the end of July in this year," and the Sheriff's proposed budget includes funding "for those 5 cameras for the remainder of 2027. That total amount is $6,300." The second grant's term "goes through March of '29" (1:23:20).[1]

What the office pays in a full year. The office puts the cost of all 10 cameras at $26,500 a year, of which the county pays $21,500. The first five were invoiced at $51,250 for four years in April 2023, and the three newer ones at $38,550 in December 2024.[42]

The renewal terms. The 2022 agreement starts its term "upon first installation and validation of a Unit" and renews automatically "unless either party gives the other party notice of non-renewal at least thirty (30) days prior to the end of the then-current term" (§ 6.1b); the order form sets 24-month renewals.[4] The Captain told the Public Safety Committee in August that the first five expire in July 2027.[2] The county has no installation record of its own.[42] If the term began with a 2022 installation, it may already have renewed into 2028, in which case ending it early carries a fee under § 6.2. Notice of non-renewal sent now is timely on either reading.

8 cameras or 10. The Administrator counted "a total of 8 that are directly attributable to the county" (1:21:09). The portal lists 10. The Captain said 2 are paid for by Rib Mountain.[2,3] Whose policy, sharing list and audits govern those two has not been stated.

What the public crime data show. The office has not released counts of hits that led to stops, recovered vehicles, arrests or convictions.[42] The FBI's public data show little measurable effect:[40]

- After July 2023, vehicle thefts in the Sheriff's jurisdiction averaged about 14 a year against about 16 before, an 11% drop. Six Wisconsin sheriff's offices without Flock saw a 42% drop, and 30 sheriff's offices together 29%.
- Property crime fell 26% in the county, 34% in the six and 30% in the 30.
- The share of vehicle thefts the office cleared rose from 48% to 72% (28 of 39 cases). That is the one number that moved in the cameras' favor, though two of the comparison offices without cameras rose as much, and vehicle thefts usually self-clear.

The counts are small, so they cannot rule out a modest benefit; they do show that any benefit is hard to see from outside. The office holds the records that could show more.

WHERE THE SHERIFF AND SUPERVISOR KREMBS ARE RIGHT

I want to be fair to the case for the cameras; several of its points are sound.

- **The cameras have helped in real cases.** In December 2022 the office credited its first camera with helping find an abducted person alive in Florida, and in August the Captain described a juvenile in crisis found and a burglary suspect caught within about 6 hours.[2,42] No one objects to those uses.
- **The task force is real.** A federal narcotics task force works from the Sheriff's Office, and drug cases do cross state lines (1:29:30). Some outside sharing serves it.
- **Some misuse has been punished.** Officers in Milwaukee, Menasha and Kenosha County were charged, and one went to jail.[17,19,20] Internal audits caught two of the cases.
- **The county's policy has some strengths.** Policy 423.3(d)1 requires reasonable suspicion before a deputy tracks one plate over time, which is stricter than the template it came from, and an alert alone cannot justify a stop.[5]
- **The law currently allows it.** No court that binds Marathon County has required a warrant, and a federal appeals court, a Virginia appeals panel and two federal trial judges have found no search on the facts before them in their cases.[32–34]
- **The 2027 amount is small.** $6,300 is a small part of the Sheriff's overall budget.[1]

Whether plate readers reduce crime is genuinely unsettled, and so is the constitutional question. The requests in this letter don't depend on either answer. They rest on what the record already shows: wide sharing, optional audits, records not yet released, and a renewal the Board can still shape.

QUESTIONS FOR THE NOVEMBER 10 PRESENTATION

The Sheriff said he has a memo "directly answering questions" for the Public Safety Committee (1:28:10). I'd be grateful if it could also address these:

1. Which of the roughly 1,580 sharing partners has the office actually worked a case with in the past year?
2. Can outside agencies' searches of county data be seen in the office's audit log, and has anyone reviewed them?
3. Is a search's case number checked against a real case file?
4. How many people in the office can search the system?
5. Who controls sharing and audits for the 2 Rib Mountain cameras?
6. Are county reads used in Flock's Traffic Analytics or any other Flock product?
7. On what date did the first five cameras' term begin, and has a notice of non-renewal been sent, or will it be?

NOTES

Sources were read between September and November 2, 2026. Hearing times are hours:minutes:seconds into the county's video.

1. Marathon County Board of Supervisors, Educational Meeting & Budget Hearing, November 2, 2026, county video, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P2GhbpI7KkY (Flock discussion 1:20:30 to 1:36:24); agenda, https://www.marathoncounty.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/19670. Quotations are from a clean-verbatim transcript made from the recording by three speech models working independently, reconciled against the audio, compared with a fourth transcription, and re-heard blind at every disputed point. The transcript is available on request.

2. Public Safety Committee, August 11, 2026, item 6A, Capt. Jeff Stefanek, county video, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tcS9bwi3F08 (1:40:04 to 2:21:13): contract dates at 2:14:15, Rib Mountain cameras at 2:14:49, audits at 2:19:41 to 2:20:41.

3. Marathon County WI SO Transparency Portal, https://transparency.flocksafety.com/marathon-county-wi-so, read October 21, 2026: 10 cameras; 30-day retention; 464,012 unique vehicles, 132 searches and 981 hotlist hits in 30 days; 2,165 sharing entries; "All system access requires a valid reason and is stored indefinitely."

4. Flock Safety agreement with the Marathon County Sheriff's Office, signed April 7, 2022 (§§ 4.1, 4.3, 4.5, 6.1b, 6.2) and order form ("Renewal Term: 24 months"), released under records request 26-2103, https://marathoncountywi.nextrequest.com/requests/26-2103 (July 29, 2026).

5. Policy 423, Automated License Plate Readers, https://www.marathoncounty.gov/home/showdocument?id=19029&t=639221284503684998, as posted August 12, 2026: §§ 423.3(d)1, (e), (h)-(i); 423.4; 423.5(e).

6. Shereen Siewert, "Marathon County sheriff will keep Flock cameras as more than a dozen Wisconsin agencies drop them", https://wausaupilotandreview.com/2026/09/15/marathon-county-sheriff-will-keep-flock-cameras-as-more-than-a-dozen-wisconsin-agencies-drop-them/, Wausau Pilot & Review, September 15, 2026.

7. Siewert, "23,000 license plate searches, no required audit", https://wausaupilotandreview.com/2026/09/19/23000-license-plate-searches-no-required-audit-inside-marathon-countys-flock-policy/, Wausau Pilot & Review, September 19, 2026: template language and its removal, audit records denied, USA TODAY audit-log data, no corrective action.

8. Siewert, "Is Flock selling your data?", https://wausaupilotandreview.com/2026/09/24/is-flock-selling-your-data-what-the-contracts-say-why-wisconsin-agencies-are-leaving-and-where-marathon-county-and-wausau-stand/, Wausau Pilot & Review, September 24, 2026.

9. Jason Koebler and Joseph Cox, "ICE Taps into Nationwide AI-Enabled Camera Network, Data Shows", https://www.404media.co/ice-taps-into-nationwide-ai-enabled-camera-network-data-shows/, 404 Media, May 27, 2025.

10. Joseph Cox, "ICE, Secret Service, Navy All Had Access to Flock's Nationwide Network of Cameras", https://www.404media.co/ice-secret-service-navy-all-had-access-to-flocks-nationwide-network-of-cameras/, 404 Media, October 16, 2025.

11. Illinois Secretary of State, "Giannoulias audit finds license plate reader company in violation of state law", https://www.ilsos.gov/news/2025/august-25-2025-giannoulias-audit-finds-license-plate-reader-company-in-violation-of-state-law.html, August 25, 2025.

12. 404 Media, HIDTA and local plate data, https://www.404media.co/how-cities-are-forced-to-funnel-license-plate-data-to-a-massive-federal-surveillance-program-hidta/, September 30, 2026; Senator Wyden's request, https://www.404media.co/following-404-media-investigation-senator-demands-info-about-white-houses-license-plate-surveillance-program/, October 2026.

13. Flock's August 2026 privacy changes, https://thenextweb.com/news/flock-safety-privacy-changes-data-retention, TNW: 7-day default retention, case codes and audit assistance required by January 1, 2027, federal agencies removed from nationwide lookup in August 2025.

14. "How rogue officers turned a nationwide camera network into a tool for stalking", https://www.adn.com/nation-world/2026/08/02/how-rogue-officers-turned-a-nationwide-camera-network-into-a-tool-for-stalking/, Washington Post, August 2, 2026, as republished by the Anchorage Daily News.

15. Siewert, "Wisconsin agencies pull Flock cameras", https://wausaupilotandreview.com/2026/09/04/wisconsin-agencies-pull-flock-cameras-as-wausau-marathon-county-contracts-face-scrutiny/, Wausau Pilot & Review, September 4, 2026 (Racine County Sheriff); WBAY, https://www.wbay.com/2026/09/04/fond-du-lac-county-law-enforcement-ceases-use-flock-cameras-immediately/, September 4, 2026 (Fond du Lac and Winnebago County agencies, including Menasha and Neenah).

16. Beatrice Lawrence, "AI-powered police cameras face pushback from Wisconsin communities", https://www.wpr.org/news/wisconsin-police-forces-use-cameras-track-vehicles-communities-worry-overreach, WPR, December 19, 2025 (Verona).

17. Milwaukee officer: resignation, https://www.fox6now.com/news/milwaukee-police-officer-resigns-misconduct-flock, FOX6, March 4, 2026; plea, https://www.fox6now.com/news/milwaukee-police-flock-camera-misuse-officer-guilty, FOX6, June 11, 2026; sentence, https://spectrumnews1.com/wi/milwaukee/news/2026/07/15/former-mpd-officer-misuse-flock-cameras-sentencing, Spectrum News, July 15, 2026.

18. Milwaukee detective: charges and how the case surfaced, https://fox6now.com/news/milwaukee-police-officer-flock-misuse-chapman-charges, FOX6; Fox11, https://fox11online.com/news/crime/tehrangi-chapman-milwaukee-police-department-detective-flock-cameras-license-plater-readers-stalking-misconduct-public-office-criminal-charge; NBC26, https://www.nbc26.com/news/state/fired-milwaukee-detective-pleads-not-guilty-to-charges-tied-to-flock-camera-database-misuse.

19. Menasha officer: arrest by Appleton police, https://www.fox11online.com/news/crime/menasha-police-officer-cristian-morales-arrested-appleton-stalking-suspicion-outagamie-county-jail, Fox11, January 7, 2026; charges, https://www.fox11online.com/news/crime/menasha-police-officer-accused-of-using-license-plate-recognition-system-to-track-his-ex-girlfriend-cristian-morales-misconduct-in-office-flock-domestic-abuse-restraining-order-cash-bond, Fox11, January 9, 2026; sentence, https://wisconsinexaminer.com/2026/08/18/menasha-office-sentenced-for-abusing-flock-as-statewide-reckoning-continues/, Wisconsin Examiner, August 18, 2026.

20. Kenosha County deputy: FOX6, https://www.fox6now.com/news/flock-misuse-former-kenosha-county-sheriffs-deputy-charged, August 19, 2026; TMJ4, https://www.tmj4.com/news/local-news/in-your-community/kenosha-county/kenosha-county-sheriffs-deputy-charged-with-misusing-license-plate-reader-to-track-fellow-deputy, August 20, 2026.

21. Racine County investigator: FOX6, https://www.fox6now.com/news/racine-county-sheriffs-office-flock-misuse-investigator-suspended-10-days, August 19, 2026.

22. Waukesha PD officer: Wisconsin Examiner, as republished, https://www.yahoo.com/news/articles/wisconsin-communities-grapple-police-misuse-104530266.html, and WAUK, https://waukradio.com/news/2026/03/13/wisconsin-communities-grapple-with-police-misuse-of-flock-surveillance, March 13, 2026.

23. Waukesha County: Autumn Billings, "Wisconsin Cops Used Flock Over 100 Times To Track a Navy Veteran", https://reason.com/2026/09/02/wisconsin-cops-used-flock-over-100-times-to-track-a-navy-veteran-after-he-lawfully-recorded-a-traffic-stop/, Reason, September 2, 2026.

24. 2021 Wisconsin Act 82, https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/2021/related/acts/82, creating Wis. Stat. § 165.85(3)(cm) (decertification).

25. Amber Newell: FOX6, https://www.fox6now.com/news/brookfield-police-stop-wrong-vehicle-after-flock-camera-error, August 7, 2026; WTMJ, https://wtmj.com/news/2026/08/26/woman-demands-answers-after-old-mpd-flock-camera-alert-leads-to-second-gunpoint-stop/, August 26, 2026.

26. Wisconsin Department of Justice, TIME System audits, https://wilenet.widoj.gov/node/4127, WILENET; January 2026 WILENET newsletter, https://wilenet.widoj.gov/sites/default/files/site-files/January%202026%20Newsletter.pdf ("the CIB audits every agency with TIME System access every three years").

27. Wis. Stat. § 175.47, https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/175/47, review of deaths involving officers.

28. *Chatrie v. United States*, https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/25pdf/25-112_0am4.pdf, No. 25-112 (U.S. June 29, 2026); also at Cornell LII, https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/25-112.

29. *United States v. Kyle*, https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.oknd.76981/gov.uscourts.oknd.76981.62.0.pdf (Oct. 1, 2026), opinion and order granting suppression; 404 Media, https://www.404media.co/federal-judge-rules-a-flock-search-was-indiscriminate-mass-surveillance-and-unconstitutional/, October 2, 2026.

30. *Commonwealth v. McCarthy*, https://law.justia.com/cases/massachusetts/supreme-court/2020/sjc-12750.html (Mass. Apr. 16, 2020).

31. *Commonwealth v. Bell* (Norfolk Cir. Ct., May 10, 2024), Virginia Lawyers Weekly, https://valawyersweekly.com/2024/06/10/criminal-photos-obtained-through-plate-reader-suppressed/.

32. *United States v. Porter*, https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/appellate-courts/ca5/25-60163/25-60163-2026-03-17.html (5th Cir. Mar. 17, 2026); Supreme Court docket No. 26-5121, https://www.supremecourt.gov/docket/docketfiles/html/public/26-5121.html, petition pending.

33. *Schmidt v. City of Norfolk*: Courthouse News, https://www.courthousenews.com/judge-holds-norfolks-license-plate-reader-use-constitutional/, January 27, 2026; Fourth Circuit docket 26-1227, https://dockets.justia.com/docket/circuit-courts/ca4/26-1227.

34. *United States v. Riley* (C.D. Cal.), Orin Kerr, Volokh Conspiracy, https://reason.com/volokh/2026/09/16/use-of-flock-cameras-is-not-a-fourth-amendment-search-district-court-rules/, September 16, 2026.

35. Wisconsin Institute for Law & Liberty, "New WILL Lawsuit Targets Warrantless, No Limits Government Surveillance", https://will-law.org/new-will-lawsuit-targets-warrantless-no-limits-government-surveillance/, September 10, 2026.

36. ACLU of Wisconsin and Electronic Frontier Foundation, petition for an original action, https://www.aclu-wi.org/app/uploads/2026/10/2026.10.14-ALPR-Petition-for-Original-Action-FINAL.pdf, Wisconsin Supreme Court, October 14, 2026.

37. "Kaul calls for state law regulating automatic license plate readers", https://cbs58.com/news/as-police-agencies-drop-flock-kaul-calls-for-state-law-regulating-automatic-license-plate-readers, CBS58, September 2026.

38. "Wisconsin lawmaker seeks ban on unchecked use of Flock cameras", https://fox11online.com/news/state/wisconsin-lawmaker-seeks-ban-on-unchecked-use-of-flock-license-plate-reader-cameras, Fox11, September 15, 2026.

39. Dane County: board vote of April 16, https://danecounty.gov/PressDetail/11852; June 4 vote, https://www.hngnews.com/the_star/local_news/dane-county-board-reinstates-80k-to-sheriffs-budget-for-new-alpr-provider/article_f1d1b021-b269-42e0-825d-be2d54dedf31.html, HNG News; planned rules, https://www.wmtv15news.com/2026/08/18/its-not-an-open-door-fitchburg-dane-county-explore-alternatives-flock-cameras/, WMTV, August 18, 2026; bids, https://captimes.com/news/government/flock-replacements-where-dane-county-would-put-new-traffic-cams/article_c057232d-ab90-474a-b97b-5aefaad679b1.html, Cap Times, September 17, 2026.

40. Felix Gallo, *Marathon County, Crime, Flock and Alternatives* (October 28, 2026), analysis of FBI Crime Data Explorer, https://cde.ucr.cjis.gov/ data, with code and data available on request.

41. Wis. Stat. § 19.31, https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/19/iv/31, declaration of policy for public records.

42. Felix Gallo, fact check of the August 11 presentation (October 22, 2026) and *Flock Cameras in Wisconsin: A Review for Marathon County* (October 2026), drawing on Flock invoices released under request 26-2633 and WSAW, December 29, 2022, https://www.wsaw.com/2022/12/30/marathon-county-sherriffs-office-is-using-flock-cameras-catch-criminals/. Available on request.

43. Milwaukee restricts Flock access to supervisors: “Flock policy, Milwaukee police agree to changes”, https://fox6now.com/news/milwaukee-police-flock-policy-changes, FOX6, August 31, 2026 (MPD: “Access to Flock technology has been further restricted to supervisors only”; sharing with surrounding jurisdictions ended; semiannual independent audits); WPR, https://www.wpr.org/news/milwaukee-police-changes-flock-safety-cameras, September 2026 (“officers and detectives will not have access”).

44. *Commonwealth v. Church*, https://www.vacourts.gov/static/opinions/opncavwp/0737251.pdf, Record No. 0737-25-1 (Va. Ct. App. Oct. 14, 2025) (unpublished memorandum opinion reversing the Norfolk Circuit Court).

45. “Flock cameras become issue in Wisconsin governor’s race”, https://www.wbay.com/2026/09/03/flock-cameras-become-issue-wisconsin-governors-race/, WBAY, September 3, 2026 (Tiffany: “pause state funding for Flock cameras”); “Milwaukee County Flock camera limits”, https://fox6now.com/news/milwaukee-county-flock-camera-limits-crowley, FOX6, September 1, 2026 (Crowley’s directive: binding standards, limits on sharing, no immigration enforcement “without a judicial warrant,” independent audits).

46. Wired, on Flock’s “OS Investigate”, https://www.wired.com/story/flock-safety-os-investigate/, August 2026; summarized in Webb Wright, “Flock’s New AI Tool Does Much More Than Track License Plates”, https://gizmodo.com/flocks-new-ai-tool-does-much-more-than-track-license-plates-2000800372, Gizmodo, August 19, 2026 (testing “with a small group of law enforcement agencies”).

47. Thomas Brewster, “Flock CEO Apologizes For Calling Activists ‘Terrorists’”, https://www.forbes.com/sites/thomasbrewster/2026/07/17/flock-ceo-sorry-for-labelling-activists-terrorists/, Forbes, July 17, 2026 (the 2025 “terroristic organization” remark and the apology); the antifa comparison as reported by IBTimes UK, https://www.ibtimes.co.uk/deflock-america-facebook-group-reaches-818000-members-1822099.

48. Joseph Cox and Jason Koebler, “In Leaked Audio, Flock CEO Tells Cops Backlash to the Company Isn’t Real”, https://404media.co/in-leaked-audio-flock-ceo-tells-cops-backlash-to-the-company-isnt-real, 404 Media, October 26, 2026.